

can measure. That is why many of us are fighting for reform to improve the health in every State, city, county, and American.

However, though a public plan will ensure so much, there are still some issues that need to be addressed in the Tri-Committee bill.

(1) Ensure physician owned general-acute hospitals that provide services in underserved communities are protected;

(2) support and strengthen language to increase health care professionals in underserved communities, especially provide grants to secondary schools in underserved communities;

(3) provide tax incentives for the development of Community Health Care Centers that are environmentally safe;

(4) introduce language to provide employers a tax credit to develop preventive services for all their employees;

(5) launch a pilot program that seeks to discontinue proven alternative medicine; and

(6) in the wake of ongoing abuse of prescription drugs, introduce language that will launch a Pilot Program to Reduce Abuses of Prescription Drugs.

This legislation will not be easy, but if we want true reform we must guarantee no one will fall through the cracks. This means solidifying every hole in our current health care system. In order to ensure this, allowing those hospitals that serve a high indigent patient base maintain daily operations. The emergence of physician owned hospitals has generated significant controversy. Yet, it is unclear whether physician owned hospitals differ significantly from those not owned by physicians. Currently the House Tri-Committee Bill, contain provisions that will effectively eliminate physician owned hospitals. "The Economic Impact of Physician-Owned Hospitals in Eight States" concluded that Texas physician-owned hospitals, which employ over 22,000 Texans, have a net economic impact of nearly \$2.3 billion on Texas economy and will pay approximately \$86 million in taxes in 2009.

St. Joseph Hospital is a general acute hospital, in Houston, TX, and the only hospital in the Houston area to remain totally operational throughout Hurricane Ike in September 2008. The limitations in the health care bill will particularly harm the hospital's ability to deliver much needed services to underserved communities. If a hospital like St. Joseph is eliminated, countless people in Houston will not receive adequate care. I seek to work with all my fellow colleagues, even those across the aisle to introduce language to exempt those hospitals like St. Joseph.

Achieving diversity in our health programs must include diversity in our health profession. We need to enact a system that includes people of every race, religion and socio-economic backgrounds. By proposing language that awards grants to the secondary education system in underserved areas to encourage students to seek health professions will improve our health care system. Encouraging young teens and young adults to pursue health care careers in areas of low population are often times only done through scholarships and grants to relieve those financial barriers that keep so many young children reaching for their dreams.

With the recent passage of the Clean Energy Act, a call for new advances in technology can be implemented in our health care system. Permitting incentives for the construc-

tion and renovation of community health centers to one of the four standards set by the National Green Building Association—Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Emerald, will ensure that the patients will be treated in an environmentally safe building. Increasing funding aims to improve the air quality and other environmental features of buildings used for the provision of health care services particularly targeting underserved communities.

While these services are great for physicians and the patients who see them, Americans are having a harder time preventing ever seeing a medical physician. Safeway has implemented a program that provides preventive services to their non-unionized employees. Based on the belief that rising health care costs are mostly driven by behavior (smoking, eating poorly, not checking your cholesterol, etc.), I seek to introduce language that will allow companies to establish a program that gives periodical screenings, questionnaires, prevention-related facilities like fitness clubs, along with advice and referrals to help improve behavior. Ensuring discounted premiums or refunds for those employees passing the screenings or showing improvement and establishing higher premiums for failing tests and no measurable improvement in behavior will hold people accountable and gives them incentives to live a healthy life style. This is the approach of Safeway, and it has kept Safeway's health care costs to \$1 billion or so a year, mostly flat over the past five years. This achievement few other companies can claim.

When it comes to healthcare, just about everyone wants alternatives, especially options that include alternative and complementary medicine. This is why introducing an amendment to provide what a large majority of respondents expect healthcare providers to do is so important. The majority of society wants more research dedicated to alternative medicine, and believes insurers and Federal healthcare programs should cover the cost of those therapies. Seventy-seven percent of the public favor more research. I seek to work with my fellow colleagues to introduce an amendment to launch a pilot program to prove alternative medical treatments, medicine, and services are safe. In doing so legislation can be enacted and will ultimately lower costs and provide the majority of the population requested sources.

Though this reform seeks to improve the lives of every American citizen, it's important we consider every American citizen. In the sudden and tragic death of Michael Jackson, introducing language to study the abuse of prescription drugs by professional entertainers. Abuse of drugs often times has an impact that goes well beyond the individual performers, and frequently encourages impressionable young people to imitate this behavior. Depiction of such conduct in film and other video programming may also lead young people to mimic harmful behavior therein relating to prescription drugs. With this study, Congress can be guided on how best to address this dilemma and ensure the life of our children and celebrities alike.

It brings great joy that the Congressional Black Caucus are at the forefront to lead our country in taking the initial steps to secure our economic future, health of our society, and the ideals of our country. There are those who want to destroy our initiatives, seek to divide

our country, and maintain the status quo, and I ask my fellow colleagues in Congress to ensure the quality of our life will not fall to the ideals of those who seek this effort. It's been a long time coming, but in this Congress and administration, America will now see a brighter day.

Ms. FUDGE. Let me say this as well as we talk about preventive health care. I do live in a community where we do have some of the best health care in the world. But what I also know is it costs three times as much to go to a hospital emergency room as it does to your doctor's office.

What I envision with this preventative care is people who now only see a doctor when they are so sick that they have to go to an emergency room will now go to see a physician on a regular basis, that they will go and have annual physical exams, they will go and have their mammograms, they will go and have their cancer treatments.

They will do that because it will be less expensive. They will have the health care to do it. We're going to make sure it is accessible because we're going to put money into these community clinics so that they can get to these clinics and go on a regular basis.

I just believe that if we do this, we're going to see a much healthier and happier America. We're going to be able to take care of our seniors, to take care of our children. I think it's going to make a huge difference in where we go as a Nation.

So I just want to be as supportive as you have been and as all of us are as we look at where we're going to take this country as it relates to health care.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I so much thank you for the opportunity to address you and this body, and I yield back the balance of our time.

DEMOCRAT'S VERSION OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House and in the aftermath of the previous Special Order that has discussed primarily the health care and health insurance issue here in America.

I notice continually the expression "health care" gets substituted for the expression "health insurance." There is a distinction. Everybody in America has access to health care, which means everybody in America has health care. Everybody in America does not have health insurance.

When we blend our verbiage, sometimes it's intentional and sometimes it's not. I catch myself occasionally using the wrong expression because our debates here blur the two. It's comparable to the situation when people say "immigrants." They sometimes

mean illegal immigrants and sometimes they mean legal immigrants. Sometimes they mean legal and illegal immigrants. Well, health care and health insurance have been blended the same way, but there are distinctions.

We should remember, everybody in this country has access to health care. Everybody in this country that needs service will get service. We're talking about how we address those that are uninsured, not those that don't have access to health care or that do not have health care.

I thought it was interesting that the gentlelady from Texas put up the poster: Republicans' ideas on health care—or health insurance. I've forgotten which that is. I look back on last week, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) put up a poster that actually had about the same title to it. The gentlelady from Texas' poster was blank on Republican ideas and the gentleman from Ohio's poster was full of question marks on Republican ideas, but they were both generated by the same people. The Democrat majority caucus produces these posters that come here to the floor.

□ 2100

But we are full of all kinds of ideas. I am happy to talk about those ideas, Mr. Speaker. Some will say that you can't beat something with nothing, and I would submit that you can beat bad ideas with most anything. And a really, really bad idea is socialized medicine, national health care, HillaryCare, ObamaCare, United Kingdom Care, Canadian Care, European Union Care. All of that is bad stuff. Freedom is good stuff. I am all about freedom, and these proposals that are coming from the Democrat majority are about diminishing our freedom, about taking away our rights, about taking away our responsibilities and in the process of doing so, devolving downward the American vitality, the American Dream, the American can-do spirit.

What kind of American would sit around and wring their hands and say, Woe is me, I can't figure out how to take care of myself? Did anybody come to America and walk through the Great Hall at Ellis Island, thinking, I'm so glad I am here now in this welfare state where I don't have to worry about taking care of myself, woe is me no longer because the United States of America will take care of me?

That kind of people didn't come through Ellis Island. Ellis Island now is a tourist center. The United States of America is a welfare state. Now they sneak into the United States, thinking, Yes, America will take care of me. They think that they have now arrived at the giant ATM of the Western Hemisphere that will provide for everyone's wants and needs. And if they aren't so sure, they just have to listen to Congress here for a while, and somebody over on this side of the aisle, as a rule, will articulate some other defined want of some people that's not a need. But

even though it's just a want, not a need, it will be declared to be a right and maybe even a constitutional right.

We have got to understand what we're doing here. It's real people that are working, real people that have jobs, real people that toil away to produce goods and services that have a marketable value; and they're being taxed day after day, month after month, tapping into the sweat of the brow of the salt of the Earth people in America.

They're being told, Your taxes won't increase. It will just be everybody else's taxes that increase and that ObamaCare is going to be a better deal than whatever care you have. But if you like yours, then you don't have to worry because if you like the health care you have, you get to keep it. That's what the President said, correct? If you like the health care or the health insurance—I'm not sure which phrase he was actually talking about—if you like it, you get to keep it.

The problem is, it's not true. The President of the United States, however powerful he is, cannot make that promise with any sense of confidence that he can keep that promise because it will not be the President that decides whether Wal-Mart, for example, keeps the health insurance programs that they have in place for their employees. That will be decided by the management of Wal-Mart who, a little over a week ago, announced that they would support an employer-mandated program that requires employers to provide health insurance for employees. Now once they made that decision, it didn't necessarily mean that they endorsed the Obama plan because it really isn't quite yet an Obama plan. There are only concepts throughout and some language that is moving through this House. But what it said was that they would endorse an employer-mandated plan.

Now that opens the door for Wal-Mart to be in a position to make the decision when the public option, the Federal Government-run health insurance policy would be set up to compete directly against the many hundreds of private health insurance policies that we have.

For the President to say, If you like your health insurance policy, fine, you get to keep it, you only get to keep it until there is an alternative there that might be a better alternative for your employer. Your employer, like Wal-Mart or any other proud private sector company that's there that is providing health insurance for a majority of their employees, will be making a decision on whether they want to opt into the public plan or they want to maintain the private plan; but also the newly-to-be-named health insurance czar will be writing some new rules for every single health insurance company in America.

Now that lays the backdrop for what was said over this last hour and the way we need to be thinking about what transpired here within the last hour. However, I've also come here to talk about a number of different things.

One of them is that if we remember correctly, Speaker PELOSI came to this Congress, and she said that she was going to drain the swamp. She was going to drain the swamp of corruption and alleged that there was corruption. Night after night a team would come down here for years—I would say 2 or 3 or 4 years—and make allegations about certain Members of Congress, allegations about the motives of certain Members of Congress. The comments about the culture of corruption was fairly baffling to me. You can point to examples on either side. But NANCY PELOSI pledged that she would produce the most open Congress in history and that there would be legitimate debate, and there wouldn't be favorites being played.

Now here is an example of what NANCY PELOSI said. She said, "I don't want to have legislation that is used as an engine for people to put on things that are not going to do what we are setting out to do, which is to turn this economy around. I have the most to prove with this package. The choices we are making are those that will work, that must work. Our economy requires it. America's families need it. This is urgent." That's Speaker NANCY PELOSI, January 25, 2009, this year, the end of January.

That was her statement about how we were going to direct the efficiency of the stimulus plan to doing what's good for our economy. We're going to turn this economy around. Well, I came down to the floor and put up this very same picture. This very same picture is of a saltwater marsh harvest mouse. This is the saltwater marsh harvest mouse. It's a mouse that Speaker PELOSI has been trying to get special earmarks for for a long time. And as she has been resisted on that, I pointed out that in the stimulus package, there were \$32 million set aside for the saltwater marsh harvest mouse. I came to the floor with a picture of this mouse and the numbers up on top.

Of course, the spokespersons for the Speaker, the defenders of the status quo, and the defenders of the person that was going to come here and clean up this Congress, the one who has now established the most draconian Congress, I believe, in history, the one that is the least deliberative body in history, the one who has launched an all-out assault on this deliberative democracy and said that she didn't have an earmark in the stimulus bill for this saltwater marsh harvest mouse and others in her defense said, Steve King made it up. He just pulled a number out of the air and made an allegation that there was an earmark in there for the saltwater marsh harvest mouse.

However, now here we are far enough down the road, here are the real facts: the \$32 million has been reduced to \$16.1 million. Now the saltwater marsh harvest mouse not only has his own special earmark of \$16.1 million, it sets aside his brackish little marsh down there by San Francisco so that he can

hop around in it and sets aside a marsh down there near San Francisco at the cost of \$16.1 million, Madam Speaker, which is no economic stimulus plan.

We're going to do the things that count. We're going to do the things that do the most for the economy. The language here: turn this economy around. We're going to do that by setting aside a hopping zone for a pet project here. This little pet, the saltwater marsh harvest mouse, he gets an earmark. You can't quite see it there, but he needs that ear notched a little bit because now he is a \$16.1 million earmark.

All this borrowing, expanding the debt to the American people, the American taxpayers and Americans not yet born, to where the debt for every man, woman and child in America today totals up to over \$37,000 per individual. Still their hearts are hardened, and still they want to raise the debt, and still they want to spend money on frivolous projects that don't have a merit that affects the people that are paying the taxes, nor could a project like that ever gain the support of the majority of the people in this Congress.

This is like the little mouse bridge to nowhere, \$16.1 million for the little pet project, notched little earmark, the saltwater marsh harvest mouse, the pet project of Speaker PELOSI. She said she came here to clean up this process to make sure that there weren't favorites, and President Obama went on at great length about how he wasn't going to sign any bill that had any earmarks in it. Then he signed a bill with about 9,000 earmarks in it, and then President Obama made other remarks about the integrity of the process.

Yet we've seen earmark after earmark, billions and billions of dollars that have been unfolded here going on our debt, stacking it up against the American people. We've seen a process that has been shut down where we get surprise bills that get dropped on us. The stimulus package was a last-minute drop on us, and we could count not days but hours of reading and understanding what's in a bill. Thinking in terms of 1,000 or more pages with 8 or 10 hours to read the bill and then try to analyze all that it means when bills reference other sections of existing code, they reference definitions that exist in other places; and then if you get something like that read through, you also have to figure out what's not in it, what's missing, what's been omitted and, furthermore, what are the implications of what is in it, and what are the implications of what's missing.

That's why we need the public. There is no one person—in fact, all 435 Members of this House of Representatives do not have among them, even if given enough time, the ability to analyze the implications of big pieces of legislation on their own, not without our staff, not without our constituents, not without people that have a direct responsibility for the components of the legislation that affects them the most.

Good legislation is written by Members of Congress that go out among the districts and among the real people that are working for a living and paying real taxes out of their income and their profits, taking a look at the circumstances of what's right and what's wrong, listening to the proposals that come from them and putting together careful legislation that brings about a right result.

Once that's put together, and then you float that out to get the input from Democrats and Republicans; and it isn't just the input from the people that sit in these seats, Mr. Speaker. It's the input from the American people that talk to the people that sit in these seats who make the difference. When you short-circuit this process, when you take this process and bypass the committee process or do a mock markup, a sham markup in a committee process and pass a bill out and then do a bait-and-switch and bring a different bill to the floor than passed out of the committee—and it has happened at least three times this year, a different bill came to the floor than was passed out of the committee because they didn't like an amendment that actually passed in the committee—they don't seem to understand that the job of the Speaker or the job of the Chair of a committee is to bring out the will of the group. That's the essential responsibility of someone who is the Speaker or someone who is the Chair of a committee, bring out the will of the group.

It's not to impose their will on the group but to bring out the will of the group even when the Chair of the committee recognizes that there are good ideas coming before the committee but maybe it doesn't exactly fit the politics that they've been directed to bring about out of committee, and when an amendment comes out of committee like, example for, an amendment that would have blocked all funding to ACORN to have the Chair afterwards change the language, send a different bill or a different piece of substance to the floor of the House of Representatives, and the Members here have a right to have full confidence that the bill that comes to the floor reflects the product of the committee, too often it does not.

The window for reading a bill and debate and deliberation has been so short that on the cap-and-trade bill, that big bill of 1,100 pages that we had a very short time to digest, was brought to the floor, was filed, scheduled for debate; and at 3:09 a.m. there was a 316-page amendment to an 1,100 page bill that was dropped into the RECORD at 3:09 a.m.; and that morning we took the bill up.

□ 2115

And we are to debate and deliberate and understand and evaluate with good judgment and due diligence the implications, ramifications and factors that come out of one of the biggest, most

important bills in the history of this Congress? I believe Congress made, the House of Representatives made the most colossal mistake ever made in the history of this House. Three hundred sixteen pages at 3:09 a.m. on an 1,100-page bill. If you wanted to read it, no one had a chance to read it. No one had an opportunity to evaluate it. It was a surprise tactic. Actually, it wasn't a surprise. We have gotten to the point where we expect those kinds of tactics. But that is bad policy. If you are passing legislation that cannot withstand the light of day, it should be pretty clear that it must be bad legislation, and the American people will reject it.

To read a bill and have time to read a bill, I would direct, Mr. Speaker, your attention, and the public's attention, to section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 which reads in part, A measure or matter reported by any subcommittee shall not be considered in the House unless the report of that committee, upon that Member or matter, has been available to the Members of the House for at least 3 calendar days. And that is 3 calendar days prior to the consideration of that Member or matter in the House of Representatives.

We have a law, Mr. Speaker, we have a law that requires 3 calendar days to read a bill. But Mr. Speaker, the "saltwater marsh" Speaker, the "personal earmark for brackish wetlands" Speaker, insists that a bill can come to the floor, and it can be a bill that no one has seen, it can be one that is written in the Speaker's office, and it can have an amendment right behind it written also in the Speaker's office just as a surprise tactic, and before the public can understand what is going on, actually before they can even believe someone would tear asunder this deliberative body in the process, it is an act of the House of Representatives messaged over to the Senate, and on the cap-and-trade bill, the 1,100 pages sat down here, the 309 pages didn't. And when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) asked the question, do we have a bill before us that is the subject of our debate? The answer that came from the Speaker's chair was—I don't remember exactly, but I remember the response: Well, we don't quite have it yet, but everyone knows what we are talking about.

So after many exchanges, finally, we suspended the operation for about 35 minutes while we went through this exchange of trying to determine, what is the subject of our debate? Shouldn't the House of Representatives have, even if no one else can get their hands on the paperwork or the electronic version, shouldn't the United States House of Representatives have at least one copy of the subject? Have got a dictionary over here, a big unabridged dictionary. It is there if someone were to argue about what the English language is. But we are here arguing about a bill that no one can look up and read. No one can verify if we are accurate. The

bill's amendment was not here. The bill was. The amendment wasn't. Later they brought the amendment down and began to integrate it. It takes a long time to integrate 316 pages into 1,100 and to get it right.

And the question was asked, If this bill passes the House and it is not available for inspection by any Members of the House, is it possible for us to message over to the Senate if it doesn't exist at the time of its passage? Well, somehow, we did. But it shouldn't be possible. The process has to be right.

We should follow the law. We should follow this section of the law that is section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That is one of the laws we should follow. We should follow the law of common decency and respect for each other and respect for the process and the Founding Fathers and for the Constitution and do due diligence and not put generational legislation up and pass it because there was a political momentum to get it done before anybody can see what it is that we are actually doing here and do it sometimes in the middle of the night.

I would be really happy to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota, who I know has been very engaged in these issues and on top of helping to clean up some of the open doors that are here for the culture of corruption that exists under this leadership of the House of Representatives.

I yield so much time as she may consume to the gentlelady of Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for this moment just to be able to speak about what is happening here in Washington, D.C. I don't think anyone has ever seen anything like what we have seen in the recent months, and we can even trace it back to last fall when the Democratic Congress could not wait to get passed the TARP funding bill together with the former Bush administration.

They were in a hurry, just like the gentleman from Iowa has stated. We are seeing that this is a Congress that is in a hurry, in a hurry because they have got an agenda. They are on a steamroller path. They are on a blitzkrieg path. They have to get everything done yesterday. We can't have time to read bills. We can't take time to truly count the costs, because we are in a hurry. There is an agenda that has to be performed.

We heard the President of the United States tell the Democrat Caucus just last week, We can't miss this opportunity for reform. We have got to get it done. We have to do it now. We can't wait. We have got to do everything now. That is what we were told last fall. We were told that we would see economic Armageddon if we didn't pass the \$700 billion TARP bill.

What was that? That was a blank check. We were told, Just trust me. It was a "trust me" defense. We were told, Just trust the Treasury Sec-

retary. They have to have \$700 billion, or we will see an absolute collapse of the financial world. And so we were all pushed into it. I voted "no" on that bill. But the Democratic-controlled Congress passed the \$700 billion bailout for the banking system and also for the foreclosure and the subprime mess that we are in.

Well, where are we at today with the subprime mess? We are seeing foreclosures still at a record high. We are seeing unemployment still at a record high. Did this help us, this \$700 billion blank check that went to the Secretary of the Treasury? What did that lead to?

Well, President Obama was all for the TARP bailout when it came, when he was Senator Obama, and then we saw in December when he was President-elect Obama, he prevailed upon the President. He said, We can't wait, we have got to hurry. We can't wait until January until I'm sworn in as President. I'm asking you, President Bush, to release to the Automobile Task Force something like \$17 billion so we can bail out GM and so we can bail out Chrysler, because it has to be done today. We can't wait until January when I'm sworn in. It has got to be done today.

So President Bush gave that \$17 billion to the Automobile Task Force at President-elect Obama's request. And we all know what happened. We saw what happened to Chrysler. It essentially collapsed in a shotgun wedding to Fiat. A foreign car company was brought in and forced to purchase and buy out Chrysler. We saw the bondholders, whose rights were virtually stripped away from Chrysler, and we saw the UAW instead jump in front of the bondholders and take advantage of that position, and now the Federal Government and the UAW and Fiat own that company.

What happened to GM? We saw that UAW owns that company and the Federal Government now, as of the Friday before last, is the 61 percent shareholder. What did that get us? One hundred fifty thousand jobs lost. Because we saw pink slips go to 3,400 dealers of Chrysler and GM across the country, and 150,000 people, potentially, are out of work. Well, then we had to get the stimulus passed, the largest spending package in the history of our country, \$1.1 trillion. Think of that: \$1.1 trillion. But it had to be done today. And we didn't have time to read that bill, oh, no, sir. We can't read that bill because this is too important. President Obama told us we had to pass that bill.

The bill was passed by Congress. I voted against it. Representative KING voted against the stimulus bill. But President Obama had to have that bill. Well, did he sign it? No. He went to Chicago. He went to play basketball. He took 4 days, rather than passing this bill he had to have in his hands, because he had to have this \$1.1 trillion stimulus bill.

Well, we didn't get that bill very much ahead of time either, and it was

a little bit embarrassing because of all the earmarks that bill contained. Oh, we weren't told they were earmarks, but they were earmarks nonetheless. All sorts of special projects were in that bill.

Then we were told we had to pass the budget bill, an 8 percent increase over the previous budget bill. We had to pass it right away. We couldn't wait and have extra time for debate, no, no, no. We had to pass that bill now because otherwise bad things might happen.

Well, what has happened? What happened as a result of the stimulus bill? We were told if we didn't pass that stimulus bill, we could see 8 percent unemployment. Wouldn't that be terrible? What is unemployment today? Nine point five percent. In the State of Michigan it is 15.2 percent. What about jobs? What about all the jobs that were created? Two million jobs have been lost since the stimulus bill was put forward. One hundred fifty thousand jobs were lost because the government got involved in GM and Chrysler and handed out pink slips. This isn't going real well for us.

Then cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, the ultimate authority that government could have over every person's life in the United States. Literally, every time we flick on a switch, it will be the government telling us how much we are going to pay to flick on that switch, or if we can even have the power to do that. Cap-and-trade, the mother of all bills, and we got that bill 13 hours before we passed that bill. Thirteen hours before, 1,100 pages, but don't worry, trust me. It will bring good things to this country. And what will that give us? We already know. Two and one half million jobs a year leave the United States. We might as well call it the "China-India stimulus plan" because we are going to lose 2.5 million jobs, bye bye, away they go, out of the United States.

And then what is the next bill we have in front of us? Well, an article today in the newspaper says that on this health care bill that we are looking at, that by the way, we have got to pass, it was revealed last week, here it was, 1,018 pages long, that the next day Members of Congress had to vote on it, and the House Ways and Means Committee revealed to the public that the next day we need to be prepared to vote on a 1,018-page bill.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't that Members of Congress are lazy. And it isn't that Members of Congress are too stupid to be able to read these bills. It is the fact that the Democrat leadership in this House is unwilling to allow us to read the bills. We even had the majority leader, STENY HOYER, probably in an accident, admit that if many Members of this body actually read the bills, there probably would be very few votes. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Iowa has the quote of the majority leader, and it says "If every Member pledged to not vote for the health

care bill if they hadn't read it in its entirety, I think we would have very few votes."

I would agree with the leader. I think that there would be very few votes if Members of Congress would read this bill. That is why the Obama administration and the Democrat leadership are steamrolling these bills through before anyone has time to be able to read it because they know, as was written in the paper today, this is by Christina Romer, President Obama's Council of Economic Advisers chairwoman, she said that this bill will cost employers \$300 billion. It will cost workers 5 million jobs. Well, let's think about that now. Five million jobs from health care loss, and that doesn't include the taxes that would be put on small businesses, so it is 5 million there, 2.5 million from cap-and-trade, that is every year though, and then 2 million from the stimulus, 150,000 from GM and Chrysler. I don't think we are going in the right direction.

And this is from a President who said that he wouldn't be raising taxes on 95 percent of the American people. Unfortunately, it appears that that promise has already been broken.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. And I can't help but reflect that the President's earliest promise on this stimulus package was that he would create or save 3.5 million jobs and that got lowered down to 2 million jobs altogether. But the instant those words came out of his mouth, I thought, why would someone say "create or save?" "Create or save," what does that mean? What would be the point of a promise that he would "create or save" 3.5 million jobs? And the answer, of course, is that if you say, I will create 3.5 million jobs, then you have to identify which jobs it is that you have created. Was it Caterpillar who he said had actually signed on with him in his stimulus plan? Was that an assumption on the part of President Obama? So where are these jobs that you would create? You would have to point to them and get a CEO that said, Yes, because of this stimulus plan, I have opened up this new production line, and here are 20,000 jobs here, and you add them all up, and you have to come up with 3.5 million. But if you say "create or save" jobs, you can always point to existing jobs and claim that you have saved them.

So in the analysis of his rationale, if someone is going to create or save 3.5 million jobs, if they are remaining, if they haven't been laid off except for the last 3.5 million and you can say, Oh, yes, they are the ones I saved. I saved the 3.5 million that were left, even though we may have lost 137.5 million jobs in the process, and he would be telling the truth.

This is a situation where we have the master of ambiguity. We do have the master of mesmerization going on at the same time. People hear what they

want to hear because the language is crafted to speak to our hearts instead of our heads.

□ 2130

When he says I'll create or save 3½ million jobs, that is mostly on the save side, not on the create side, because this has gone south in a sad way. And we've seen our unemployment go from the promise that it could go above 8 percent to 9.5 percent. How many people is that, Mr. Speaker?

Well, the number is 14½ million unemployed. That's the ones on the unemployment roll. Then there's another 5.8 million people that don't qualify for unemployment that are looking for a job. So you add the total up to that, and it isn't hard to get up in that number of over 20 million.

And there was an article written just the other day. I believe it was in *National Review*. I've forgotten the name of the author that had done the calculation of this. And the projection was that it's closer to 25 million people unemployed, especially when you account for those that are underemployed, those that have seen their hours reduced.

So we have had the data that shows that unemployment, the extended period of time that people are claiming unemployment is longer than it's been. I believe the number is the longest it's been in 48 years of unemployment. And at the same time that was extended, the length of unemployment benefits, we've also seen people who are working fewer hours per week. So we have a lot of underemployed that don't qualify yet as unemployed.

This economy that's here completely misunderstands what this economy is about. This is the experiment of the Keynesian economists on steroids; the people that believe that you can borrow money to no end, grow government to no end, replace private sector jobs with government jobs, and stimulate the economy with borrowed tax dollars, and buy goods that are made in China and borrow money from the Chinese to buy them.

This whole circle doesn't work. You have to produce things that have value, and you have to lay out the truth when you do it.

I want to go back to this statement that I made earlier, and just very briefly point out section 108 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 that says this. And without reading all that language through, it says, 3 days to read a bill or we're not going to take it up on the floor. That's the law. That's the law, but apparently the Speaker of the House isn't bound by the law, and I hope that there was a way to enforce that. And I actually don't know how we enforce such a law. Republicans are doing all they can do, everything they can do procedurally.

This is the quote, of course, from the majority leader that said, if every Member read the bill, well, there wouldn't be a bill because they would

come to grips with their senses or else the public would make sure that they did.

This is a list of the bills that were rushed through to the floor, and many of them were addressed by the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN). But here in the 111th Congress, every controversial bill passed by the House has been forced through in less than 3 days, in violation of this section of the code here. In less than 3 days. Every one has violated this section 108 of the code, every one of these controversial bills.

And to take you through them, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2000, the stimulus bill. I guess I didn't really know what the real name was. The stimulus bill, \$787 billion that was rammed through in less than 3 days. Violation of public law 108, section 108.

Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, rammed through, and this violates the very principle that SCHIP was established on in the first place, and it's designed to bring about, to close the gap so that we end up with a mandatory national health care act. It's one of the incremental changes that are there. They actually passed out of this House a bill that was 400 percent of poverty, that would have paid people's health insurance so that children in families making over \$102,000 in Iowa, and some of those families would have been paying the alternative minimum tax, in fact, 70,000 families in America would have been, well actually in the end, are paying the alternative minimum tax even though their children's health insurance is paid for because SCHIP is designed to pay health insurance on children whose families can't afford it.

So, \$102,000. Tax them some extra in the rich man's alternative minimum tax. And we tax them so much they can't afford to provide health insurance for their children, so we buy them health insurance, and we rush the bill through. And by the way, in there it opens up the door for Medicaid to provide health care for illegals under Medicaid. That rule was also changed in this and the data that I put out holds up to be fact.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007. That was the bill where Lilly Ledbetter alleged that she was discriminated against in a job way back some years ago. There was a statute of limitations on that bill, on the legislation that she sought to sue her employers under. The statute of limitations had expired, long past. And still Democrats argued that, even though the Supreme Court upheld the statute, that they thought it just wasn't fair. The old "it ain't fair" brothers got at it again and decided that they wanted to change the rules after the fact.

I'm okay with changing the rules after the fact, as long as it doesn't affect the people that were living under the law at the time, during the fact. But this was retroactive. This was like

double jeopardy for the taxpayers. And the Lilly Ledbetter Act rammed through this Congress.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, rammed through Congress. Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, rammed through. Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2009, the big stacked bill that runs the government when you're afraid to do appropriations in a legitimate way, rammed through. No amendments either, by the way.

Then, to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from the TARP's AIG bonuses. So we had to ram through TARP, and then when the rules weren't written in TARP with any oversight, then AIG decided to pay millions of dollars of bonuses to people that worked for them, retention bonuses they were. But 11 of the people no longer worked for AIG. They got part of the millions in retention bonuses, too. That had to be rammed through because Democrats were vulnerable to public criticism because they had passed legislation that opened the door, and they rammed legislation through quickly so there wasn't an opportunity to evaluate, debate, amend or scrutinize. And the result was hundreds of millions of dollars paid off to provide retention bonuses for AIG executives, at least 11 of whom didn't work for AIG anymore. So we had to pass some legislation to take the public's pressure off of the people that opened up the door for that legislation. So that was that.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009, rammed through. The American Clean Energy and Security Act, which, I'm sure—yeah, here we are. The cap-and-tax bill, rammed through. All of these major bills rammed through in violation of public law section 108. Three days to read the bill. That's the law.

You know, they've got the votes to repeal any piece of legislation that's been passed by any previous Congress. When you've got the votes to do that, you would think you have—remember the audacity of hope that comes from the White House? You would think you'd at least have the audacity to change the law instead of violate it. That's what I'm seeing here in this Congress, and it really irks me to see people do this to our Congress and to our system.

This is the President's promise. I spoke to it but not—I didn't quote it. The President said, We need sunlight before signing bills. Too often bills are rushed through Congress and to the President before the public has the opportunity to review them. As President, I will not sign any nonemergency bill without giving the American public an opportunity to review and comment on the White House Web site for 5 days. Barack Obama.

Does that sound like anything we've seen him do?

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'd yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I'm wondering what he means by that, by 5 days. Does that mean that once the bill gets to the President, he'll allow it just to rest on his desk for 5 days? People would have a chance to comment?

But it also seems, the public law that the gentleman from Iowa displayed, Members of Congress are supposed to be able to get a chance, too. I think this is wonderful that the President wants the American people to have 5 days to be able to read a bill, but I think it would be wonderful if Members of Congress could have 5 days to read a bill before we vote on it. After all, maybe we should all take an Evelyn Wood speed reading course, because if we have to read over 1,000 pages or 1,100 pages in a bill in 13 hours, we're going to need to have maybe those recordings where they're sped up a little bit so it sounds like Alvin and the Chipmunks reading a bill to us. I don't know what it's going to take, but Members of Congress should also have the opportunity to be able to read the bills, and to do that, we need to have time, too. So this doesn't say much.

If President Obama says that a bill should just maybe be on his desk for 5 days, if Members of Congress aren't also given that courtesy, after all, we are the people's representatives. We're sent here on behalf of the people back home to read these bills, talk about these bills between Republicans and Democrats. Isn't that what we're supposed to do, talk to each other, talk about what our ideas are, what the ideas on the other side of the aisle are, make the bill a little bit better, then put it on the floor?

Maybe part of the problem, I wonder, is the fact that we're just trying to do things a little too fast. That's what it seems like to me, that maybe this Congress is trying to rush through too much too fast. Maybe that's why we have a greater deficit than we've ever seen before.

We ran out of money in April. Back in April, this Congress spent all the money that it had in its budget already in April. So every day we've been spending billions and billions and billions, every single day that we don't have. And so now, today, it's July, we're already over \$1 trillion in deficit. We're going to be nearly \$2 trillion in deficit.

And here's something else I don't understand. The President is supposed to release, in mid-July, the budget update. We have the numbers already, but the President has said he's going to wait until mid-August to release his budget update.

Now, this is a little concerning to me, a little fishy to me, because we're being told, Mr. Speaker, that in less than 2 weeks' time the President of the United States expects that we will pass legislation that would allow the Federal Government to take over 17 percent of the private economy.

Now, there was an economist from Arizona State University 2 weeks ago

on the front page of the Washington Times who wrote an article that said, we now have the Federal Government, for the first time, having control or owning 30 percent of all private business profits in this country. Thirty percent of all private business profits in America are owned or controlled by the Federal Government today.

If President Obama and if the Democrat-controlled Congress gets their way, that will be an additional 17 percent.

Now, this President's only been in office for 6 months, and already 30 percent of the private business profits are owned or controlled by the Federal Government. Now, by August 1st he wants to make that 47 percent? I certainly hope we can read these bills first before we're asked to do that.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. And as you talk about that percentage, 30 percent, the private business profits in the country, who would have been believed a year ago or 8 or 9 months ago, who would have believed that eight huge private sector entities would be nationalized by this administration?

We have three large investment banks nationalized by this administration, one large company, AIG Insurance, nationalized. Fannie and Freddie used to be private, became a government-sponsored enterprise, and now they're wholly owned by the Federal Government, with about \$100 billion dropped into each and about \$5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities wrapped up in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And of course we have General Motors, 61 percent, and Chrysler a smaller percentage. I don't remember that exact number.

But then you've got, also, the Canadians that own about 12½ percent of General Motors and the unions that own 17½ percent of General Motors. There's not a lot left out there for the bondholders, the people that were the secured creditors, because they got aced out.

Who would have thought eight huge entities, hundreds of billions of dollars, and taking these companies off, out of the private sector and put them into the hands of government control?

And the President fires the CEO of General Motors and hires his guy, Fritz. And the President cleans out the board of directors at General Motors and appoints all but two of the board of directors of General Motors.

And then he says, the President says, I'm not interested in the day-to-day operations of General Motors. I don't think we should be running the place. I don't want to do the nationalization of this. It is just something that we have to do.

And here's the irony of it. President Obama was elected at least in part because he attacked George Bush for going into Iraq and not having an exit strategy. Now, President Obama has gone in and nationalized these eight

huge private sector companies that I have listed here, and he says he doesn't want to be nationalizing and he doesn't want to be in the day-to-day operations, but he names the CEO, replaces the board of directors. His car czar is on the phone every day with the chairman of the board of General Motors, sometimes multiple times a day. Well, that was the former car czar. We don't know what the future car czar is going to be. We've got 32 czars.

□ 2145

The President is in the formerly private sector. He got invested in all of that. He found a crisis, capitalized on it: nationalized. Now, I have read the Web page for the Democratic Socialists of America. That is exactly their plan. It is in print. In fact, it's more aggressive than on their own Web site. The President has nationalized proud private-sector corporations, and he has done so without an exit strategy.

All at the same time, he has been critical of President Bush for not having an exit strategy in Iraq. President Bush's exit strategy in Iraq is in print. It's called the SOFA Agreement, the Status of Forces Agreement, negotiated and agreed to by President George W. Bush. The exit strategy for Iraq was victory, victory with honor, victory and leave a legacy of a self-governing democracy of a moderate country that could govern themselves and that could control their own national destiny.

All of that is in place today, and President Obama is carrying out the exit strategy of George Bush to the letter, spelled out in the Status of Forces Agreement, without a peep in the media about what's going on over there. All they talk about is we're deploying out of Iraq. No, we're deploying out of Iraq cities back to the bases because the surge worked.

Now, President Bush had an exit strategy. He didn't talk about it completely because he had to be a little flexible. He carried out his exit strategy. He ordered the surge. He negotiated the SOFA Agreement. He handed over an Iraq in a war that was won. The war was won on the day that Barack Obama took the oath of office here just outside these doors, and now it needs to be sustained and maintained. Afghanistan is a lot harder, but there is an exit strategy in place set by George Bush. There is no exit strategy for these eight private companies that have been nationalized by President Obama.

When I see the picture of President Obama standing next to Hugo Chavez and when they ask me what that tells me, I say, you know, the chief nationalizer is our guy, not their guy. Our guy has nationalized more companies and more billions of dollars' worth of privately held assets than Hugo Chavez ever dreamed of doing—well, at least within the last year. Chavez might have added a bit more companies over time, but so far this year, he

has only taken out one Cargill rice plant, and has nationalized that in Venezuela.

It is a chilling thought to think of how fast this Nation has lurched to the left. We've leaped off of the abyss, and we've got to figure out how to fly to get back to where we are in the free markets again.

So I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota to pick up from there.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

There is a lot to contemplate when we're talking about this national take-over of health care. The gentleman has every reason to be concerned because, when the government takes over an area of American national life as we have seen, the American people are the ones who lose control and who lose choice over their economic destinies.

Here is one thing we've been hearing about from the Speaker of the House. She has been talking about how this nationalization of health care will be paid for through prevention, that we'll have new prevention in place that will keep Americans healthier and that we will realize something like over \$500 billion in savings in prevention.

Well, where is it? Itemize it. What is it that we aren't doing now that we're going to see dramatically occur in prevention? It isn't there.

It's not going to materialize because we know where the savings will come from. It will come from the Federal bureaucracy, and we have the Federal bureaucracy that's contained in the bill that the Democrats have put forward. This big mess that's on this chart shows 32 new Federal Government agencies. This is what will stand between any American and his doctor. So think of an American standing on that side of the paper with 32 bureaucracies. You've got to get through this labyrinth, Mr. Speaker, before you can get to your physician.

Now, is this what Americans want?

A study was just completed that showed that 89 percent of Americans today are happy with the health care that they receive. Another study that was done said 77 percent of Americans are happy with the health care that they receive. Now, that doesn't mean that our health care system is perfect. It isn't. One of the greatest things that we can do is to make all Americans' medical expenses deductible on their insurance. That would be something great that we could do for the American people because the biggest problem in health care today is not access; it's the cost. Health care premiums are going through the roof. Well, what can we do?

We could change the Tax Code, and we could allow Americans to purchase their health care the same way they purchase their car insurance—across State lines, buy in pools, bring down the price, have true competition, and allow small clinics like the MinuteClinics, for instance in Min-

nesota, to be set up all across the United States. Have health savings accounts so that you control your own costs, and you take it with you. The government doesn't own your health care. You do.

Mr. Speaker, this is the plan that President Obama wants for the American people, a great labyrinth of bureaucracy. How are you ever going to get your health care if you've got to go through this bureaucracy?

One thing we know about bureaucracies is they justify their own existences, and they all make a lot of money. The average Federal employee today makes about \$75,000 a year plus benefits. There are a lot of people out there who would love to make \$75,000 a year. Well, we're creating 32 new bureaucratic agencies. This is nonsense. This is about a government-created welfare bureaucracy. That's what this is about. It's not about insuring more Americans, because even under the Democrats' own forecast, not all Americans are even going to be covered.

Potentially, about half of the people who are uninsured now can afford to pay for that insurance. Of the other half who can't afford it, we have a good amount of people who are under 35 who are in very temporary situations. About a third of those people are illegal aliens. Truly, only somewhere between 12 and 16 million people aren't insured. That out of 305 million? Surely, we can find an answer for them.

Why wreck the health care that 89 percent of Americans say they like so that we can give government control over 17 percent of the American economy? Why do we want to do this?

This is President Obama's vision for American health care. It's not what Americans want. There is no savings extracted out of prevention, not to the level that they're talking about. We need to get real about health care, and that's why the American people need to melt the phone lines of their Members of Congress. They need to let them know what they think about this plan before it's too late.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Having seen the Technicolor, modern version of the National Health Care Act that has been delivered to us courtesy, so far, of a committee or two here in the House of Representatives, I went back through the archives and dusted off this scary concept here. Some will look at this and will recognize what this is:

This is the 1993-1994 HillaryCare version. This is a copy of the poster that is the precursor to the full color one that Mrs. BACHMANN put up. This poster was on my wall in my construction office back in those years, and it actually hung there for years. I hung it there for years as a reminder to me of what they could cook up if you put people in a room and closed the door.

Remember, this was a secret process, too. It was driven about the same way.

It's a process that they don't want the American people to weigh in on, so they met in secret week after week with all of this intensity and with all of these—Ira Magaziner, do you remember that name? Harold Ickes was another one. These people were meeting in there. They were smart people. They put smart people in a room. I can tell you what happens when you put a whole lot of smart people together and you give them an assignment, Mr. Speaker. Highly intelligent people will always overcomplicate things. The reason they do that is, otherwise, there wouldn't be any particular advantage to being highly intelligent.

So you could just go down to the simple solution to the complex problems and let human nature take over, and all would go on just fine. But, no, we put highly intelligent people in place, and these are generally liberal elitists who are working to try to create this utopia here on Earth because they do think that is the "be all and end all" for them. It is not for us.

So here is the HillaryCare version. I look down through this list, and there are some things that concern me a lot: the Regional Health Alliance, the ombudsman. Why do you need him? You need another ombudsman here. The Accountability Health Plan, that sounds really familiar. I think that might be different lingo there. The HMO provider plan, I don't know that that's in there. HMOs were de rigueur then, but now they have reached a little bit of criticism. Here is one, the global budget. Why do you need a global budget to provide national health care?

So of all of these things on this schematic, this schematic, this scary flowchart, is, I think, the biggest thing that sunk HillaryCare back in the '90s because the American people looked at that, and it scared them that anyone could cook up such a schematic. This is the black-and-white version that could be printed back then, which was just shortly after the advent of the Internet.

Mrs. BACHMANN has the full Technicolor version, and I would appreciate it if the camera would turn there.

If the camera would focus on the colored chart, on the bottom are two identical-sized purple circles. The one on the left is the qualified health benefits plan, and the one on the right is the Obama plan, the Obama health insurance plan. The white box to the left of the left purple circle is the existing health insurance, the traditional health insurance plans. None of them could qualify to sell insurance to any American until the health insurance czar qualifies them to go into the purple circle, the qualified health benefits plan circle. The health insurance czar would be the guy who would make sure that the new public health plan that was written could compete with the private plans.

So if you're going to write the rules for your guy, are you going to make one size fits all? Are you going to put

conditions on those private insurance plans so that the public plan can compete? Or are you going to take the public plan and try to get it to compete with the private sector? I think it's the former, not the latter. I think we will see a one size fits all.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That was the aspect of the Hillary plan. It was an outlawing of all private insurance. The one thing we know from page 16 of the 1,018-page bill is that no more private insurance policies can be written—never, nada. You can't write any more private insurance. Of course, if the public option is subsidized by government at 30 to 40 percent less than the private insurance plans, what we know from the Levin Group is that 113 million Americans will be collapsed out of private insurance and will be put over into the government option, thus collapsing the private insurance industry. It will all be government, and that's within 5 years that we will see the end of private care in the public.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence, and I know I've convinced you deeply, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today through July 31 on account of back surgery.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of being unavoidably detained in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CARTER, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 21, 22, 23 and 24.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 21, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2727. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Use of Commercial Software (DFARS Case 2008-D044) (RIN: 0750-AG32) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2728. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Motor Carrier Fuel Surcharge (DFARS Case 2008-D040) (RIN: 0750-AG30) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2729. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Lease of Vessels, Aircraft, and Combat Vehicles (DFARS Case 2006-D013) (RIN: 0750-AF39) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2730. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Lead System Integrators (DFARS Case 2006-D051) (RIN: 0750-AF80) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2731. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Limitation on Procurements on Behalf of DoD (DFARS Case 2008-D005) (RIN: 0750-AG24) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2732. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Acquisition of Commercial Items (DFARS Case 2008-D011) (RIN: 0750-AG23) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509 (K); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2734. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting Selected